

it is necessary that there be a mandatory referendum in order to give the people in these areas an opportunity to be heard when the very powers of their local government structures are being eroded by acts of the legislature.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Bard to speak in opposition to the amendment.

DELEGATE BARD: Mr. Chairman, my statement has already been made.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Singer to speak in opposition to the amendment—I am sorry, Delegate Needle.

DELEGATE NEEDLE: Mr. Chairman, I think the reasons for opposing this amendment were very aptly stated yesterday, and the results were reflected in a vote of 90 against the amendment and 20 in favor.

As Delegate Moser has indicated, this amendment goes much further than yesterday's, which was so soundly defeated and I suggest that it be defeated again. However, I think there is one thing inherent in this amendment which Delegate Sybert probably did not intend, which I find somewhat attractive but will not support nonetheless, and that is that it eliminates even the permissive referendum on the establishment of a popularly elected regional government.

I do not think that he intended that result. As I have said before, I prefer that there be no referendum with regard to establishment of such regional governments, but I nonetheless will support the Committee recommendation suggested in defeat of this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes E. Churchill Murray to speak in favor of the amendment.

DELEGATE E. MURRAY: Mr. President, this entire subject has been a rather delicate one from the beginning. I think that we knew before we came here that it would necessarily be so. We certainly must have known before we came here that the increasing problems of the State, the increasing population of the State, would necessarily bring this question to the floor, and whether there were any Convention or not, the question would exist. The question will intensify.

This certainly does not speak to the point of the boundary of this area. It

speaks, I think, to the question of what authority will be given to the regional government. As Delegate Sybert has pointed out, it does not seem to me yet to be clear or positive that this authority cannot so hamper that it would virtually destroy the local county government.

I am sorry that anyone brought up the question in terms of city versus the counties. This does exist, perhaps, but certainly we should get as far from it as possible. We are going to have to look at this entire situation on a far broader basis than that for the survival of all.

On the other hand, I do not think that we should blindly accept the proposition. I have no doubt that it can be so worded that the interests of the counties can be protected without being jeopardized. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment? Delegate Hanson?

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. Many of the reasons for this opposition have already been stated, but I think there are a few things that are very important to emphasize. One is the point made by Delegate Clagett, that this amendment, if adopted, would make it impossible, without having a referendum in both counties, for the boundaries of the Suburban Sanitary Commission or the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission to be extended. It would make it possible for an extension of those boundaries in Prince George's County to be vetoed by the voters in Montgomery County. One of the most difficult problems that has existed in developing systems of government for regions in the United States has been the ability of one unit of government to veto the point of view favored by all the surrounding units of government. This has been the case in St. Louis County. It was the case for a long time in the Davidson-Nashville area which eventually overcame the referendum problem. It was the case for a long time in Dade County. As for Toronto, Canada, the metropolitan organization was formed by the action of the provincial legislature, and not on the basis of a referendum of the people.

That point aside, I think the central question here is whether the voters in one county should have the right to veto the wishes of the General Assembly when that law can in itself be referred to the people under the general referendum provisions,